Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701  301:473-8186

10/2/67

Dear Sylvia,..

We are mostly moved, including our bodies, will be God knows how long getting straightened out, finding things, etc.

Spent the part of the day the dentist left in the Archives. Had pictures tak with a millimeter rules showing the actual dimension of the back end of the bullet and a few others Thimpson didn't have made. Will get them in a week. I've run into something new: Classification of documents that have been released on the ground that an error was made in declassification. In this case it was a Liebeler staff memo that I do not recall as clearly as I might. Expecting a Xerox, I made no notes.

Do not make copies from me of documents I send you. I now have two photo-copy machines, so don't waste time. I have one like Maggies, probably an older version, and the thermofax. Because I still have to pinch pennies, what I will most often do is send Thermofaxes, for that paper, where I now get it, costs less than half as much and is lighter (on airmail).

Please tell me what you know about the Joesten ed. His British publisher has been in touch with me and if he is doing the Joesten pot-boiler I will disassociate immediately. He is a thoroughly irresponsible man and has made us all vulnerable, as I believe you know.

Unfortunately, I know very little about your and Maggie's books, so there is little than I can send you. If I get or see something that I think you are interested in, like you with the palmprint and Maggie with Oswald's weight and address, of course, I'll send. Alas, I recall little of what you sent me last year (or was it the year before?) and had only a glance at the table of contents. I know less about Maggie's. I do not even know its name. I wanted to include a reference to it, thinking it would let those who read my book know of hers, but she hasn't responded to my inquiry. Perhaps she doesn't want it. She has been silent for quite some time. I hope it is only because she stays busy. Beth also has been silent. Nine note from Lillian today. Maggie did give her a message.

Sylvia, none of us has a license to be only right, and Manchester had none on being wrong. You are wrong in saying Garrison has nothing on the Birch, Minuteman, and Dallas police. I cannot say of the White Russians. I have given him enough to justify the quots in your letter (I will read the excerpts from his appearance before I go to bed, but I wanted to answer you immediately. Remember, Penn, rightly or wrongly, has long claimed to have some minuteman-police connection. He now know of material turned over to the police that seems never to have gone to the Commission. I now know that Wade also refused to give him files. I know who gave what documents that are important to which members of the police department, etc. You also ignore one possibility of Oswald's involvement in a conspiracy that is on page 138 of WHITEWASH: innocently. In this connection, if you can send me the Robert Oswald thing slipping on his statement he believed Lee was about to tell him something, I'll copy and return. It could be just this, Lee's recognition. I have from the first felt he was a pidgeon, but initially

lacked enough to be certain. In my mind, I am now certain. It flows from his right-wing Cuban connections, and he did have them. This does not mean he was part of a plot to kill the President. This also does not mean he was aware of the existence of such a plot, either. There is no doubt in my mind Garrison is convinced he was framed.

It is not necessary for you to explain anything. My point is a simple one: please try and understand that what you intend in some of the things you have done is not the way others take them. This is no reflection on you or your integrity. It is only an effort to make you understand that it is so with all of us. I cite the Epstein case because I sincerely disagree with your judgement on it. I made the same initial error myself. We are all independent-minded individuals. Those of us who are honest, and I think this is most of us, must recognize that we cannot agree on all things. So, if and when I say things like this, please do now feel called upon to defend yourself, for that is entirely unnecessary and wastes time none of us has...I know nothing about Thompson or his book or his beliefs.

Whether or not you approve of the adversary system of justice, it is the kind of law and custom we have. I think Garrison has not violated either its word or its sense. I think it not a fair comparison to equate him and Specter, for what Specter did was ex parte. Garrison's must stand in court, where there will be another side and where there will be vigorous defense. I think you fail to acknowledge the very real problem he faces, of trying to prevent the advance poisoning of all the potential judges and jurors, and of the intimidating effect on witnesses of some of the things that have happened. Let me give you an example from my own experience: I developed certain, I think very important, information from Crest Pena that Liebeler suppressed, cut off whenever Pena tried to volunteer it. He agreed to appear before the grand jury. Garrison arranged this when I was down there. I took one of Garrison's assistants to him and he repeated what he had told me and would on the next Sunday have gone before the grand jury. Then Bringuier filed and entirely frivolous suit against me (which was costly to me in cash and many other things). Next he filed an insane suit against Pena, based only on what is totally privileged: his WC testimony. First, this cost Pena $500.00 just for his retainer for his lawyer. His lawyer told him that if he wants to keep from having to defend expenses for this story, there is only one way: silence. So, he is silent now. It also happens that the Bringuier suit against me, even though it was immediately tossed out of court on one of the defense so obvious I suggested it, also cost me a Louisiana distribution. The distributor's lawyer was mine in this suit. He read PW and assured his other client there was no libel in it. Makes no difference. When last I heard, he had not responded to Paraller on Oswald in N.O. He never answered me. There is this very real problem. I fear it and the consequences may make a trial impossible.

I have a fear you have not articulated: that Shaw will not live to come to trial. He was CIA. They will not want him on the stand. He will not be able to get away with what the CIA pulled in the Baltimore libel suit.

It is an imposition to write when one types as poorly as I without reading and correcting. I hope you understand I intend it as no abuse. It is past a reasonable bedtime and there are things I must yet do.

In responding re William I thought of something I'd like you to think about. That is my present plan to have a large appendix of documents in my Manchester book, those that are appropriate that backstop WWII and others. However, there will be quite a number on a variety of subjects that I will not be able to use. There are some of us I'd like to be able to have access to these. If you can conceive of a feasible, safe mechanism, I'd like your suggestions. I do not know when this will be. I cannot now predict a schedule because Hall's withholding of all funds, even an accounting, confronts me with quite serious financial problems. I continue to get documents when I see that I do not intend to use myself but think one of us should have and use. I may use them in speeches in the future. I think they are important. In fact, were I not worried about real money, I'd be getting more than I am. Recently, I have developed some rather interesting data. I have already written a postscript to POST MORTEM. I may yet add to that... Keep me posted on the schedule on your book and tell me how I can help. Sincerely, H.